

REMARKS

Claims 1, 28 and 41 are amended.

Claims 44-48 are new.

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC 101

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not reciting patentable subject matter. More specifically, the Office Action held that because the claims allegedly do not meet the Machine-or-Transformation Test ("The claim should recite the particular machine or apparatus to which it is tied, for example by identifying the machine or apparatus that accomplishes the method steps"), the claims are deemed not to recite patent-eligible subject matter and the burden is passed to Applicants to demonstrate compliance.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 41 to identify the machine or apparatus that accomplishes each of the method steps.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter recited in claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38-41 now recite patent-eligible subject matter and the request that the rejection be lifted accordingly.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103 (a)

1) Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38 are rejected as being obvious over Joao, Hormozi, Bell, in view of the newly cited Schick reference (US 2002/0065698).

Applicants amend Claim 1 to add the steps of:

- creating, on a vehicular dealer computer platform, an electronic folder for the vehicular part, the electronic folder comprising description information including information relating to a type of said vehicular part;
- storing the electronic folder on the vehicular dealer computer platform;
- after the electronic folder is stored and created on the vehicular dealer computer platform, transmitting, by the vehicular dealer computing platform, the electronic folder to the central server;
- transmitting, by the assessment center computer platform, the updated electronic folder to the central server;

Applicants believe that such steps serve to clarify that the electronic folder is a data entity that is transferred between computing platforms of the networks and stored at least on the vehicular dealer computer platform. In order to create an electronic folder, the user does not need to access the central server. This is contrary to the teaching of Joao which specifically states at para [0283]: "At step 201, the user will access the central processing computer 10 via the user computer 20 and enter data and/or information regarding the user and/or the vehicle in question."

The other foregoing rejected claims depend from Claim 1 and thereby include the limitation found therein. The same arguments therefore apply to such claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection against claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-20, and 38 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

2) Claims 28, 29, 31, 32, 36 and 43 are rejected as being obvious by Joao (US2002/00116655A1) in view of the newly cited Schick reference (US 2002/0065698).

Claim 28 is amended to recite similar limitations as those included in claim 1. The same arguments therefore apply and withdrawal of the rejection against claim 28 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The other foregoing rejected claims depend from Claim 28 and thereby include the limitation found therein. The same arguments therefore apply to such claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) against claim 28 and all the claims depending thereon is respectfully requested.

3) Claim 41 has been rejected as being obvious by the combination of Joao and Hormozi further in view of Schick.

Claim 41 is amended to recite similar limitations as those included in claim 1. The same arguments therefore apply and withdrawal of the rejection against claim 41 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

4) Claims 33, 34 and 37 is rejected as being obvious by Joao in view of Schick.

The rejection is believed to be overcome by the amendments effected in claim 28 on which claims 33, 34 and 37 depend.

Withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 44-49 are new. Support for these claims may be found at least in paragraphs [0019] to [0036] and Fig. 2 of the application as published. Entry and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

In view of the above arguments and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in good condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

Wilfried Blum et al.

By:

/C. Marc Benoît/

C. Marc Benoît

(Reg. 50,200)

Agent of Record

Benoît & Côté, s.e.n.c.

Tel: (514) 658-4844, #210

Customer No.: 76753